

Date: Mon, 14 Feb 94 07:32:43 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #151  
To: Info-Hams

## Today's Topics:

ARLD009 DX news  
Copying High-Speed CW: Print or Script?  
License from Panama?  
Looking for LOGIKEY keyer  
soldering PL-259 to coax  
Vertical Antennas

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 14 Feb 1994 06:34:24 -0700  
From: agate!library.ucla.edu!news.mic.ucla.edu!unixg.ubc.ca!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!  
alberta!ve6mgs!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARLD009 DX news  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SB DX @ ARL \$ARLD009  
ARLD009 DX news

ZCZC AE07  
QST de W1AW  
DX Bulletin 9 ARLD009

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 1994 00:14:58 -0800  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!mcws!UsenetToss@ames.arpad

Subject: Copying High-Speed CW: Print or Script?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I copy all CW in block capitals. I have always done that, and am used to it, so that's what works for me. I can copy at almost any speed but can't write much faster than about 35 or 40 wpm so I end up just taking notes when in a QSO. 73 DE K6DDX

-----

Date: 11 Feb 1994 15:38:17 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!  
doc.ic.ac.uk!uknet!pipex!sunic!news.funet.fi!klaava!klaava!  
mjokinen@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: License from Panama?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am one of these hopeless creatures, who cannot raise the 40 marks per minute cw-cpy-speed to 60 which is the limit for the senior class licens in our country. In the junior class we are allowed to phone operations only on the 28 mHz band. As I am planning a longer yachting voyage and I would like to be in contact with my fellow countrymen through ham radio, it would be interesting to know if it is true that you may buy for yourself a ham licens from Panama. How much would it cost?

-----

Matti Jokinen  
Institute of Dentistry  
University of Helsinki  
Matti.Jokinen@helsinki.fi

-----

-----

Date: 11 Feb 1994 15:52:28 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!  
cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!  
rdewan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Looking for LOGIKEY keyer  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

-----

In article <slayCL0wC3.u0@netcom.com>, Sandy Lynch <slay@netcom.com> wrote:  
>Hannes Hogni Vilhjalmsson (hhv@rhi.hi.is) wrote:  
>: Can anyone tell me the present address of the Logikey Company,  
>: or any other outlet for their LOGIKEY microprocessor based morse

>: keyer?  
>  
>If I'm not mistaken, the LogiKey is the commercial version of the CMOS  
>Super Keyer II which was first described in the November 1990 issue of QST.  
>That keyer is available in Kit Form (i.e. parts, pcb, but no switches,  
>boxes, or batteries) from:  
>  
> Idiom Press  
> Box 583  
> Deerfield, IL 60015  
>  
>When I bought mine (it is a WONDERFUL keyer), I paid \$45 + \$3 for domestic  
>USA shipping. Foreign orders were \$45 + \$5.

The Logikey keyer also is sold by the same company: Idiom Press. Last  
I saw in an ad, the price for Logikey was \$129 +s&H

BTW, Idiom Press is run by Bob Locher, W9KNI, top US operator in  
the just released CW DXCC list. He is also the author of a book  
on DXing and the author of the DXing chapter in ARRL Operating Guide.

He is an A1 operator.

Rajiv  
aa9ch  
r-dewan@nwu.edu

---

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 94 19:31:05 EST  
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!  
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!nigel.msen.com!ilium!sycom!p-cove!  
wolfman@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: soldering PL-259 to coax  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

junger@rsg1.er.usgs.gov (John Unger) writes:

> Has anyone had any experience (either good or bad) using one of  
> the small butane torch/soldering irons to solder PL-259 connectors  
> to RG-8U coax. Do they work as well as or better than a big  
> (>100W) soldering iron?

I have had real good luck with a little 5 watt iron. All I do is let it  
heat up for a while, then hold it on the pl-259 and the coax shielding on  
the inside. If I wait like that for about a minute, and then melt the solder  
on the tip and let it run into the hole and wait another min, I get a  
real good connection.

See ya.

73 de Aaron  
KB8PFZ

---

wolfman@p-cove.uucp (Aaron Smith)  
Amateur radio station KB8PFZ

---

Date: 11 Feb 1994 15:50:21 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!  
jms@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Vertical Antennas  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Alan Bloom (alanb@sri.hp.com) wrote:  
: Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: : Yes, yes, I understand that, but look at what you're saying, "the  
: : current is \*still\* 1A in \*each\* 1/4-wave element." Since the dipole  
: : has \*two\* elements, 1+1=2, it's instant flow is twice the current  
: : of a single element.

: If you installed RF ammeters in each element, they would read the  
: same no matter whether the ground plane is present or no. (Since  
: the RF generator and both elements are in series, the current must  
: be the same in each.) Each 1/4-wave element radiates 1/2 the total  
: power no matter whether the ground plane is present or no.

: (Is anybody else still following this convoluted discussion?)

: AL N1AL

Yes, but you're both over my head. I still read it, though.

Mike, K0TER

---

Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
SB DX ARL ARLD009  
ARLD009 DX news

The items in this week's bulletin are courtesy of Steve, W9NUF; the Northern Illinois DX Association; Ed, KB7E; and the Ohio/Penn and Yankee Clipper Contest Club PacketCluster networks. Thanks.

**PETER FIRST ISLAND.** 3Y0PI has been very active and should remain so until about February 19. DXers bemoaning the tough winter of 1994, check this out. Last Saturday 3Y0PI had to QRT for 12 hours due to a storm that battered the team with 80 MPH winds and dumped five feet of snow on them. And this is during the Antarctic SUMMER/FALL.

Although some equipment was damaged, the team has made well over 20,000 Qs, more than 20 percent of their 100 Kilo-Q goal. Listen for them on CW, SSB, AmTOR, PactOR and satellite. EME operations should commence soon. QSL CW via KA6V, SSB via AA6BB.

**LACCADIVE ISLANDS.** Geology students VU2STG and his newly licensed XYL are on an exploration and study assignment. During free time they operate VU7LI on SSB only. Please be patient as amateur radio is not the primary purpose for their visits to the Laccadives and equipment is minimal. QSL via VU2STG.

**SOVEREIGN MILITARY ORDER OF MALTA.** According to Luciano, I0JBL, the 1A0KM operation has been rescheduled for sometime in late February.

**ANGOLA.** D2EGH can be found on 14225 kHz at 2000z. QSL via CT1EGH. Listen for D2/AA4HU on 14225 kHz at 1745 and 2000z.

**BANGLADESH.** S21AM has been worked on 14185 kHz SSB at 1200z. QSL via Manju, P0 Box 4000, Dhaka.

**ETHIOPIA.** ET3RA has been on 21250 kHz at 1600z. QSL via HB9CVB. ET3YU works CW on 14035 kHz between 1600 and 1700z.

**ISRAEL.** For the past two nights, Chicago area hams have worked 4X4NJ on 1832 at 0420z.

**MAURITIUS.** Jacky, 3B8CF, is a relatively easy catch on both 80 and 40 meters. Try 3506 kHz at 0200z and 7007 kHz at 0420z.

**QATAR.** A71BH can be worked on 14215 kHz around 1300z. QSL via OH6EEG.

**FRENCH POLYNESIA.** Walter, DJ0FX, is active as F00PT from Moorea Island of the Windward Group, IOTA OC-046. This one should be on until February 19. Walter operates on all bands, mostly CW. Check the low end of 40 meters between 0730 and 1000z. QSL via the DARC Bureau.

SAN ANDREAS ISLAND. HK0/K1WGM has been worked on 160 meters around 1833 kHz at 0430z. Also check 80 meters on either 3505 or 3510 kHz between 0400 and 0600z. QSL K1WGM.

CAMBODIA. An operation by Laszio, HA0HW, is slated to begin in early April. The call signs XU9XA and XU0HW have been mentioned.

COSTA RICA. An operation is planned for February 17, 18 and 19 from Guanacaste Island, a new IOTA island off the northwest coast. Call signs will be K5MK/TI7 and TI2WLE/TI7. Try 14260 and 21260 kHz for SSB, and 40 kHz up from the bottom edge for CW. QSL via K5MK.

THIS WEEKEND ON THE RADIO. Indoor sports this weekend include the North American Sprint, Phone; the EA RTTY Contest; the New Hampshire QSO Party; and the YL OM Contest. For more information on these events, check pages 127 and 128 of January QST.

NNNN

/EX

---

Date: Mon, 14 Feb 1994 13:10:00 GMT

From: agate!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!EU.net!  
sunic!psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org!jbloom@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Feb11.003343.2956@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <bote.760946660@access1>, <1994Feb12.160701.4407@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>

Subject : Re: Medium range point-to-point digital links

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: In article <bote.760946660@access1> bote@access1.digex.net (John Boteler)  
writes:

: >I have gotten a bug up my rear to configure our point-to-point  
: >repeater linking system with digital paths ranging 20  
: >to 40 miles apart.

[deleted]

: Well lets look at some numbers and see. Lets assume  
: you want "broadcast" grade audio. That's a SNR of  
: 50 db. Digital transmission regenerates bits so  
: that above a certain threshold level the effective  
: SNR is only the quantization error of the digital  
: equipment itself. A crude way of looking at this  
: is to consider this error as bit jitter at the lsb-1.  
: So an 8 bit system would have a SNR of  $10 \log(2^8) = 27$  db.  
: That's obviously not good enough. 16 bits yields a SNR of  
:  $10 \log(2^{16}) = 51$  db which is close enough for our purposes.

Use  $20 \log(x)$ , since we're talking about a voltage ratio. An easy rule of thumb is 6 dB of SNR per bit of quantization. It's actually a tad better than that, since the quantization error is not constant; sometimes the error is a small fraction of one LSB, sometimes it's up to half an LSB. 8 bits will give you about 50 or so dB of SNR.

: Now the Nyquist limit says we have to sample at a minimum  
: of twice the highest frequency in the audio. If we assume  
: that's 5 kHz, then our minimum sample rate is 10 kilosamples  
: per second. That requires a very good brickwall filter, however,  
: so sampling is usually done at a somewhat higher rate, say 3X  
: or 4X the highest audio frequency. Lets pick 3X. So our required  
: bit rate is  $16 \times 15,000 = 240$  kb/s. That's not going to fit in a  
: normal FM two way radio bandwidth, so we're going to have to  
: resort to trickery.

Yes, you sample at that higher rate, but then you digitally filter with a near-brick-wall filter and reduce the sample rate to very near the Nyquist rate, via decimation. (Consider compact disks.) At the receiving end you interpolate to raise the sample rate back to something that can use reasonable reconstruction low-pass filters. So, a more realistic analysis gives a transmitted 10 kHz sampling rate at 8 bits per sample, for 80 kbit/s.

: Codecs use various compression schemes to lower the effective  
: bit rate. Delta modulation is one such trick, and LPC (linear  
: predictive coding) is another. These are effective real time  
: compression methods, but do suffer some artifacts. Or we can  
: take a page from the newer high speed telephone modems and use  
: LZW type on the fly lossless compression and complex modem  
: encodings that use less than one baud per bit. Off the shelf  
: modems can deliver up to 56 kb effective data throughput over  
: voice grade channels wsing a base baud rate of 600 baud. That's  
: not quite good enough though.

Even if you could make that degree of m-ary coding work on a radio link, which I have my doubts about.

: Or we can abandon voice grade radios for the links and use purpose  
: built digital radios with higher baud rates. If we take a 56 kb  
: WA4DSY RF modem (GRAPES), and couple that with an on the fly  
: compression scheme like LZW, we can easily get the required 240 kb/s  
: throughput for broadcast grade audio without dealing with the timing  
: artifacts of delta modulation or LPC. Occupied bandwidth would be  
: less than 70 kHz.

In my experience, LZW doesn't compress speech all that well. You'll be lucky to get a 2:1 compression; you certainly won't get 4:1. Worse, you

won't get that compression consistently. Some parts of the transmission will be compressed more than others, leading to timing/buffering problems. You really want a compression scheme that is tailored to speech.

: If we can settle for less than perfection, however, Motorola has  
: a codec scheme that they claim can fit a digital voice signal in  
: the same bandwidth as a NBFM voice signal, IE 20 KHz. It won't  
: work through off the shelf FM radios though, a purpose built  
: radio is required, and it won't yield "broadcast" SNRs. I have  
: the write up on it around here somewhere, but can't lay my hands  
: on it right now. I seem to recall that its an 8 bit system so  
: the SNR is going to be around 27 db. It should be noted that hams  
: consider the 20 db quieting level "full quieting" and thus perfectly  
: acceptable audio quality.

8 bits is entirely adequate (see above). I'm not familiar with the Motorola system, but I suggest that it is probably \*not\* using a lossless compression scheme. That means that you'll experience some additional noise/distortion, beyond quantization noise.

: >I just received a catalog from Consumer Microcircuits  
: >Ltd in the U.K. listing a CVSDM codec. I remember  
: >playing with these in electronics lab in college;  
: >would these provide a narrow enough digital signal  
: >to shove through a radio system designed for 5KC  
: >bandwidth given a band-limited audio input to the  
: >codec?

: I don't know this codec. What are the specs? Note that  
: typical telco "voice grade" codecs have a bit rate of  
: around 16 kb/s by use of aggressive coding schemes.  
: Using MSK methods, that could be transmitted in a  
: 22.4 kHz channel. But they won't deliver the "broadcast"  
: grade audio you apparently want.

I've done some playing with MX-COM's CVSD codec. While I haven't analyzed the SNR, "by ear" it produces reasonable reproduction at 32 kbit/s and audio I can stand to listen to (barely) at 16 kbit/s. At 64 kbit/s, its audio is entirely acceptable for amateur purposes. IMHO.

[deleted]

--  
Jon Bloom KE3Z jbloom@arrl.org

-----  
Date: Wed, 9 Feb 1994 17:32:45 GMT

From: netcomsv!netcom.com!greg@decwrl.dec.com  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jan28.171743.483@arrl.org>, <gregCKI0zw.Kuo@netcom.com>, <1994Feb3.190229.8136@arrl.org>s.a  
Subject : Re: RAMSEY FX TRANSCEIVER

(excuse inclusion of a lot of text, but since Messrs. Hare and Bloom can't be relied upon to quote in context and fairly, and to limit attributions to what was \*said\* rather than what would be convenient for their attacks, it would seem necessary)

In article <1994Feb3.190229.8136@arrl.org> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom (KE3Z)) writes:

>Greg Bullough (greg@netcom.com) wrote:

>: In article <1994Jan28.171743.483@arrl.org> ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV)) writes:

>: >Greg Bullough (greg@netcom.com) wrote:

>: >

>: >: Steven has hit it on the head. As hams, we have for years said "can't afford a commercial rig? Home-brew or build a simple kit." Then QST and all the other magazines which bang this drum (which quite handily fills up magazine pages with circuits that few ever build) reap big advertising dollars from kit companies.

>: >

>: >For starters, I am not sure that few ever build projects from magazines.

>

>: Why? Haven't you polled your readers, in order to make intelligent editorial decisions? Haven't you asked 'if not, why not?' '73' has an article-by article reader feedback form, every issue. If you don't have the information, you really aren't in much of a position to either support or refute my assertion, are you?

> Well, at least Ed doesn't make "assertions" that he can't support with data. If he doesn't have the data at hand, he doesn't make statements as though they were facts.

As I have stated before, and as even someone with a sixth-grade level of literacy ought to be able to glean from the above exchange, it was Mr. Hare who initially indicated that he was 'unsure' of his facts. I responded that such a thing surprised me, having assumed that some survey would have been made and its results disseminated to the staffers. Since the issue in question was one of being in or out of touch with the ham population at large, this was very pertinent.

He apparently mis-represented that; he indeed does believe that he has facts at hand.

> But I **\*do\*** have the data at hand. Our recent (1992) market survey  
>shows that 35% of amateurs "enjoy building equipment or kits." 42%  
>enjoy "experimenting with equipment or antennas." So the statement that  
>few ever build circuits is clearly unsupportable.

> Now, where's **\*your\*** data?

I guess I consider almost 20 years as an active ham a pretty good basis for what my fellows do and don't do.

But let's look at these "facts" with a critical eye, shall we?

1. 35% is not exactly a clear majority, now is it?
2. The 42% includes 'or antennas.' Considering that antennas are generally NOT plug-and-play items, I'd expect MOST hams have to do it. Does this mean the other 58% hate it?
3. The phrasing of the question begs for a higher number. They 'enjoy' it. I 'enjoy' sunning on the beach on a tropical isle. Doesn't mean I do it, or get to do it, very often. But I would submit that there are some vested interests in asking the question that way. Such as the advertising dollar. And such as justifying the existance of QEX.
4. The very existence of QEX can be taken to mean two things; there is sufficient interest to support a whole distinct publication; or there is insufficient interest to put the material into the mainstream.

And that it really doesn't support conclusions any more than the average Joe Ham's experience. Of course, Joe Ham spends his money based on his experience, more than Mr. Bloom's data. And it is also that experience which leads him to stay in the hobby rather than take up snowmobiling.

>: >Some of the authors that have offered a kit have reported  
>: >large sales  
>  
>: And god bless 'em if they do, for they are the ones who recognize  
>: that parts procurement is 90% of the problem and 200% of the  
>: expense of home-brewing. Someone who take the time to write an article,  
>: and then offer a kit, with no intention of profiting by either is,  
>: IMHO, entitled to some sort of sainthood.  
>  
>But, according to you, QST shouldn't publish such articles. Isn't that  
>just a bit, well, inconsistent?

Yes, and that should have been your first hint that you were, well, not correct in your interpretation of my position. Perhaps if you took the time to read and understand, you might gain insight outside of the boundaries of greater Newington.

>: >something else. Go to any hamfest, note the rows upon rows of >: >vendors offering components. Hams are buying them, putting them >: >in bags and taking them home. They must be doing something with >: >the parts.

>

>: In my experience, they're gathering bits for something they'll >: 'get around to someday,' and or looking for a specific component >: for some simple use.

>

>So, hams are hoarding basements full of parts without ever using any of >them? \*That's\* your experience? Wierd!

Aw c'mon. You mean to say you don't know bunches of hams with garages/ basements full of stuff that they're going to assemble when they get 'a round tuit' along with some half-finished projects, and most of the parts for this or that? Where have you been?

>Well, I did an informal poll of the technical editors and lab staff >here at HQ. Of the 10 people I talked to, one (count 'em) received his >license after the age of 20. So we've \*all\* had experience outside the >environment of ARRL HQ. We weren't born here in the ARRL Lab, you know! >And only a few of these people have EE degrees. (Just enough to keep >the other ones on the straight and narrow!) So, once again, the >available evidence shows your "assertion" to be in error.

'Had experience' and where you work every day are two different things. You get used to things. After five or more years, for example, it would seem strange for me to work somewhere that had no internet access, even though I know most people don't have it, and can remember what it was like when it was a challenge to move data to a system four miles away. That's normal. It really doesn't hurt anything, unless you \*forget\* that you're in a different situation from most people, and fail to accept that you have to do some different things to allow for it.

>I'm not going to rehash no-code, but I'll note in passing that this >statement has all the accuracy of your other ones.

We must agree to disagree on this one. I, also, was opposed to no-code. The difference between myself and the ARRL on this one is that I now admit that I was being stupid, and club-ish, and elitist.

>: way, the League and QST have flirted with this policy from time to >: time, but they can't seem to get away from the 'all home-built' ideal.

>  
> Do you \*read\* QST? Have you seen the "New Ham Companion" section? I  
>challenge you to find \*one place\* in the ARRL literature where it says  
>a new ham should homebrew his station in order to get on the air. Just  
>one place.

It was all over the older League publications.

Perhaps, if I have some time, I'll look up some citations.

Perhaps, Jon, you can fill us in on when the League and the editorial staff thereof, consciously chose to change to a editorial policy where home-brew was presented as an ancillary activity, rather than as an ideal?

>full-page ads in \*other\* magazines. (Hey, maybe that's it... maybe all  
>your complaints are really about another magazine, and you've just  
>confused it with QST! At least that would explain why all of your  
>"assertions" are 180 degrees out.)

Gee, wouldn't it be useful if we had an ARRL staff which, instead of attacking \*MEMBERS\* whose perceptions disturb them, claiming that 'all of your "assertions" are 180 degrees out' took the time to figure out what's wrong? Why do some people look at the ARRL this way? Why aren't a majority of the hams members? Why do memberships lapse?

>: More correctly stated: 'by what the Directors want hams (particularly  
>: new hams) to see.'

>  
>Really? On what basis do you supply this correction? Facts, please,  
>because all the information \*I\* have (from sitting in the editorial  
>review meeting every week) shows that what the editors discuss is what  
>we think the \*members\* want to read. And on the rare occasions I've  
>heard a Director comment on the content of QST, it's invariably been to  
>relay a \*member\* complaint or concern.

I guess that means that the content is pretty well in tune with the Directors' desires, then. Again, I base this on the facts that:

1. QST is an official journal
2. QST seems to be as good at covering opinions which dissent from the League line as the National Review is at covering liberal politics; conversely, the League's positions are about as well covered in QST as conservatives are in the National Review.

I rarely see something in QST which would help a member make up his mind on an issue.

Perhaps it should be that way. I know I'd rather see it that way, and see it honestly admitted, than see it denied.

>: And good it was. QST Product Reviews are the ONLY ones I would ever  
>: trust. Mostly because I've seen gushing, press-release quality \*articles\*  
>: in 73 and CQ, masquerading as product reviews. It only begs the question  
>: of why, when this landmark kit has been on the market for several years  
>: already, it was just recently the subject of a review in QST. Lots of  
>: stuff of much lesser interest has appeared before this one. I mean,  
>  
>Uh, lesser interest to who? Got any support for that, Greg?

The first thing that springs to mind was the review of the SWL receiver which was in the PR section a couple months back. Did it really deserve a full-blown review? It was a piece of equipment of only secondary (and to give due credit, by the time the review was perused, I understood it to be more like 'tertiary') interest to hams. The question is, was a full review necessary to establish that?

>: I bought one of the close-outs of the first Ramsay 146 kits on sale  
>: a good two years ago! Haven't got around to assembling it yet, but  
>: I wish I'd known what to watch for before plunking even the bargain-basement  
>: price on the counter.  
>  
> Since you ask...we originally bought one of the Ramsey units in the  
>summer of 1991.

...that would have been a good time.

> This was the earlier version (the FTR-146). We built  
>it and were in the process of reviewing it when we received a call  
>(unsolicited) from one of the folks at Ramsey, saying that they had  
>noticed we bought one and thought we'd be interested in knowing that  
>they were about to release a new design, and perhaps we would want to  
>hold off our review of what was about to become an obsolete unit. (At  
>the same time, I reported to Ramsey that the radio failed to meet  
>harmonic spectral purity requirements.) They promised to send us one of  
>the new units as soon as it became available. (Normally, we only  
>\*purchase\* Product Review items, but we decided that it would be hard  
>for them to fine-tune a kit :-)

> We waited a couple of months, then called Ramsey. To make a long  
>story short, we called \*every\* couple of months, but we never received  
>the promised radio. Finally, we just bought one (through a third  
>party). This is the unit we reviewed. In March of 1993, we contacted  
>Ramsey to report that the radio we built didn't meet FCC specs. They

>offered to send us one of their built radios, so we could check it  
>against ours. We did so, and found that \*their\* radio didn't meet  
>specs. In fact, it worked just like the one we built. We reported  
>that to them and asked that they provide a fix to the spectral purity  
>problems. They did so, and we implemented the fixes (as described in  
>the review article).

> This entire process took just about two years, the bulk of which was  
>our waiting for Ramsey to deliver a promised radio--that we never got.

This is interesting information indeed! Certainly, there is some 'fault' with Ramsey. It may even be that they knew what the likely results would be. We'll never know.

However, the option to purchase existed all along. And, it seems to me, that:

1. There was \*some\* responsibility to somehow inform the readership of the problems seen with the first kit. After all, these kits are probably one of the most appealing items, especially to new hams, on the market today. QST was very accomodating to Ramsey. Would that they would have been so to us! Again, this goes to an issue of being 'in touch' with what hams need.
2. It is quite possible to 'tune' a kit. You can make sure that all the components are within design tolerances, you can take a very careful parts inventory, you can look at the PC board with a very good magnifier, and you can generally make sure that it's in the highest percentile of what you turn out.

I wish, and I suspect some others do, that QST had pushed harder on this one, and been more out front with those of us that pay the bills. Especially when, as in this case, the initial work pointed to the possibility of a serious problem.

It's a much higher calling to point out problems for the ham-consumer, than it is to review the Conglomerate 1001D 8-band transceiver with DSP; of course the 1001D is a more fun toy to play with, but 95% of the time it works pretty much as advertised (across three color pages of QST, I might point out).

What it comes down to is, you guys knew, or at least had an inkling, that there might have been a problem. And you didn't tell us! I guess I'd expect that either you'd find a way to tell us, or push to get the Review done, to settle the matter.

And \*THAT\* is the kind of thing that I'm talking about when I claim that there is a divergence between what the ham radio population needs

from the League's publications, and what they get.

I can think of no better example. And the 'facts' are Mr. Bloom's.

Greg

---

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #151

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*